

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 17 and 18 has been amended. New claim 31 has been added. No new matter has been added. The remarks below in response to claim rejections refer to the claims as amended herein. Claims 1-31 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 17-19 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Roth, U.S. Patent Pub. 2005/0001744 A1 (“Roth”).

As to Claim 17, Applicant submits that Roth does not disclose the following limitation:

an input control circuit operable in a first mode to receive a set of values and to store the set of values in the first block of CAM locations and a copy of the set of values in the second block of CAM locations, and operable in a second mode to receive first and second sets of values and to store the first set of values in the first block of CAM locations and the second set of values in the second block of CAM locations

Roth discloses a multiple match flag circuit that may be added to a 2:1 sub priority encoder contained in a second or third stage of a three stage priority encoder (Roth, Para. 41, lines 1-5, Para. 49, lines 1-3, and Para. 52, lines 1-6). The multiple match flag circuit receives two match flag signals, MF0 and MF1, from a previous stage of the priority encoder. An AND gate receives the match flag signals and provides its output to an OR gate (Roth, Para 49, lines 4-5). The OR gate also receives a multiple match flag signal from a prior stage and outputs a multiple match flag signal (MMFout) (Roth, Para 49, lines 4-5).

In contrast to Applicant’s claim 17, Roth does not disclose or suggest an input control circuit operable in a first mode to receive a set of values and to store the set of values in the first block of CAM locations and a copy of the set of values in the second block of CAM locations, and operable in a second mode to receive first and second sets of values and to store the first set of values in the first block of CAM locations and the second set of values in the second block of CAM locations.

Because Roth lacks at least the above recited limitation, Roth does not anticipate claim 17 nor dependent claims 18,19, and 21 which depend from and further limit claim 17.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 20 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant acknowledges the allowability of claim 20 if so amended, but respectfully declines to amend the claim at this time in view of the foregoing remarks with respect to base claims 17 and 18.

Applicant acknowledges that claims 1-16 and 22-30 are allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would be helpful in any way, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

In the event that an extension of time is required in connection with this submission, applicant hereby petitions for such extension of time.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 501914 for any fee due in connection herewith, including any fee required for extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEMWELL MAHAMEDI LLP

Date February 27, 2006

/Charles E. Shemwell/

Charles E. Shemwell, Reg. No. 40,171
Tel. 408-236-6645